

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed May 18, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this application, each of the rejections set forth in the Office Action has been carefully considered, and amendments have been made in the claims.

Claims 1-10 were previously pending in this application, and are amended herein. Claims 11-21 have been added, and no claims have been cancelled. As a result, claims 1-21 are pending for examination, with claims 1, 6 and 11 being independent. No new matter has been added. The claims as presented are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as purportedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,609,128 to Underwood ("Underwood"). This rejection is respectfully traversed, as the cited reference fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited by the amended claims.

A. Claims 1-5 and 18-19

Claim 1 recites an information distribution system for use in a system in which a user device is in communication with a plurality of provider systems including at least first and second provider systems, each provider system being operable to process a transaction initiated by the user device, each transaction comprising a provision of information by the user device, the information provided for a transaction with the first provider system comprising a first component of information which is also useful for a transaction with the second provider system. The information distribution system comprises an interface which receives the information provided by the user device; a database, in communication with the interface, in which the information received from the user device is stored; and an information manager in communication with the database and the plurality of provider systems which is operable to identify the first component of information from among the information provided by the user device and provide the first component of information to the first and second provider systems.

The cited reference fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of amended claim 1. For example, Underwood fails to disclose or suggest an information distribution system comprising an information manager operable to identify a first component of information from

among information provided by a user device, and provide the first component of information to first and second provider systems.

Underwood discloses a system for maintaining consistency among third-party application components implemented in a custom system solution (col. 10, lines 26-28). Underwood discloses that as third-party application vendors continue to produce new product releases which incorporate technical advances, it can become difficult to ensure that the applications continue to operate as designed in a given system (col. 10, lines 37-40). As a result, Underwood discloses a framework which enables individual components to be changed with minimal impact on the system as a whole (col. 10, lines 41-43). The framework includes a table which references text phrases displayed to an end user using codes so that frequently used text phrases may be more easily managed to maintain application integration and consistency (col. 17, lines 52-67). As noted in the Office Action, the framework also includes a directory accessible via a user interface for managing users, groups and schema objects employed by the system (col. 43, line 25 – col. 44, line 14, described with reference to FIGS. 10-14).

Underwood does not, however, disclose or suggest anything at all related to an information distribution system comprising an information manager operable to identify a first component of information from among information provided by a user device, and provide the first component of information to first and second provider systems. Indeed, Underwood does not disclose or suggest provider systems operable to process a transaction initiated by a user device.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 is allowable over Underwood, such that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Underwood should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 and 18-19 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

B. Claims 6-10 and 20-21

Claim 6 recites a method for use in a system in which a user device is in communication with a plurality of provider systems including at least first and second provider systems, each provider system being operable to process a transaction initiated by the user device, each transaction comprising a provision of information by the user device, the information provided for a transaction with the first provider system comprising a first component of information

which is also useful for a transaction with the second provider system. The method comprises (A) receiving the information provided by the user device; (B) storing the information received from the user device; (C) identifying the first component of information from among the information provided by the user device; and (D) providing the first component of information to both the first and second provider systems.

As discussed above with reference to claim 1, Underwood fails to disclose or suggest identifying a first component of information from among information provided by a user device, and providing at least a first component of information to first and second provider systems. Underwood also fails to disclose or suggest provider systems operable to process a transaction initiated by a user device.

As a result, claim 6 is allowable over Underwood, such that the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Underwood should be withdrawn.

Claims 7-10 and 20-21 depend from claim 6 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 11-17

Claim 11 recites at least one computer-readable medium on which instructions are encoded which, when executed, perform the method recited by claim 6. For the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 6, claim 11 is allowable over Underwood, such that the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Underwood should be withdrawn.

Claims 12-17 depend from claim 11 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,
Kae-por F. Chang, Applicant

By: *Randy J. Pritzker*
Randy J. Pritzker, Reg. No.: 35,986
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
Telephone: (617) 646-8000

Docket No.: I0287.70003US00
Date: August 17, 2005
x08/18/05x